

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 9, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 1, 5, 10 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants acknowledge the withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement mailed June 2, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 5 is objected to because of an informality. Applicant have amended claim 5. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,313,898, issued to Numano et al. (hereafter "Numano"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Numano fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Numano fails to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device including "first and second alignment layers... to form at least two domains having different liquid crystal alignment directions in the pixel; and an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains" as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application.

Numano further fails to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes "an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains on one of the first and second substrates" as recited in independent claim 10 of the present application.

As illustrated in FIG. 22, Numano discloses a LCD device that includes an alignment layer 19, a black matrix 16 and pixel electrodes 12, 12a, such that "the position of the disclination can be fixed between the adjacent pixel electrodes" (col 16, lines 25-28). However, Numano

fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10 of the present application. Specifically, Numano fails to teach or suggest “first and second alignment layers... to form at least two domains having different liquid crystal alignment directions in the pixel; and an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains” as recited in independent claim 1; and Numano fails to teach or suggest “an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains on one of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 10.

Because Numano fails to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claims 1 and 10, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 5-9, and claim 10 and its dependent claims 12-13 and 16-20 are not anticipated by Numano. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 3-4 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Numano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,837, issued to Song et al. (hereafter “Song”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Numano nor Song, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Numano and Song fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes ““first and second alignment layers... to form at least two domains having different liquid crystal alignment directions in the pixel; and an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, from which claims 3-4 depend.

Numano and Song further fail to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes “an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains on one of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 10 of the present application, from which claims 14-15 depend.

Applicants have discussed above the deficient teachings of Numano. The Office Action relies upon the teachings of Song to remedy the deficiencies of Numano such that if the teachings of Song were used to modify the device, which Applicants do not concede there is proper motivation to do, the resulting combination would provide a device having all the

combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Song discloses, for example in FIG. 3B, “a linear protrusion 5 having a wedge-shaped cross section... formed on a lower substrate” (col. 5, lines 29-30). However, Song fails to teach or suggest “first and second alignment layers... to form at least two domains having different liquid crystal alignment directions in the pixel; and an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains” as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application. And Song also fails to teach or suggest a multi-domain liquid crystal display device that includes “an electric field distorting means on a boundary and overlapping the two domains on one of the first and second substrates” as recited in independent claim 10 of the present application.

Because Song fails to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1 and 10, Song fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Numano, and no combination of Numano and Song would provide all the features recited in the claims of the present application. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-4 and claim 10 and its dependent claims 14-15 are allowable over Numano and Song. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/713,192
Amendment dated November 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated August 9, 2005



Docket No.: 8733.971.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant